DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 081 343 HE 004 501

TITLE	Black Colleges and Federal Relations: A Handbook for Administrators.
INSTITUTION	Moton Coll. Service Bureau, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	[72]
NOTE	66p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Guides; *Educational Finance; Federal Aid; *Federal Government; Financial Support; Grants; *Higher Education; *Negro Colleges

ABSTRACT

This handbook for administrators presents six articles dealing with black colleges and federal relations. The articles concern institutional coordination of proposal preparation, the role of the federal relations officer, the federal relations officer and academic planning, the federal relations office management and records, and federal resources information. Appendices of related material are included. (MJM)

ED 081343

BLACK COLLEGES AND FEDERAL RELATIONS

A Handbook for Administrators

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Moton College Service Bureau
2001 S Street, N.W.
Suite 601
Washington, D.C. 20009

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

About the Bureau

The Moton College Service Bureau, a program sponsored by the Moton Memorial Institute, Incorporated and supported by a grant from the United States Office of Education, provides technical assistance to eighty-three predominately Black institutions in the related areas of proposal stimulation and preparation and Federal agency advocacy.

One of the components of TACTICS (Technical Assistance Consortium to Improve College Services), it lists among its primary objectives the strengthening of programs of federal relations for its members institutions.

BLACK COLLEGES AND FEDERAL RELATIONS

A Handbook for Administrators

CONTENTS

	i	Introduction
John F. Potts	3	Institutional Coordination of Proposal Preparation
L. A. Warner	13	The Role of the Federal Relations Officer
Leonard E. Dawson	19	The Federal Relations Officer and Academic Planning
Anthony Campbell	27	The Federal Relations Officer as Advocate
J. Wiley Brown	33	Federal Relations Office Management and Records
Ernestine Knight	43	Federal Resources Information
	57	Appendices
	71	Notes on Contributors

INTRODUCTION

This publication is an outgrowth of the activities in which the Moton College Service Bureau and its member institutions have been engaged since November 1971. The articles represent the thinking of the authors after numerous visits to college campuses engaged in constant dialogue with presidents, federal relations officers and other college administrative personnel during this period.

From the experiences gathered from these visits, seminars, and workshops it has become increasingly apparent that there are some necessary ingredients for a successful federal relations program which should be spotlighted. We have attempted to identify, amplify, and emphasize these independent components for those who wish to strengthen their federal relations program. This is the main purpose of this booklet.

Special consideration is given to the duties and responsibilities of the FRO and his role in academic planning and federal agency advocacy. The establishment of procedures for office management and the maintance of records are also given special attention. Institutional coordination of proposal preparation and federal resources are dealt with in-depth.

The Moton College Service Bureau hopes that this publication will provide information which will enable other member institutions to design more adequate and responsive programs of federal relations. It is our considered opinion that a well-coordinated, aggressive approach for federal funds is an essential part of a successful grantsmanship program.

INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATION OF PROPOSAL PREPARATION

Preparing and submitting proposals to federal agencies for funding is a comparatively new experience for Black colleges. It was not until 1965 with the passage of the Higher Education Act of 1965 that sufficient funds were made available to institutions of higher education to make proposal writing a profitable venture. Previous Congressional legislation, namely the National Defense Education Act of 1958 which provided loans to students, the Higher Education Act of 1963 which provided grants and loans for college facilities and the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 paved the way for this significant piece of legislation which included among its provisions financial aid to "developing institutions" in which category most Black institutions fell.

It must not be assumed that all of these colleges and universities waited until 1965 to seek Federal funds. Some of the more aggressive administrators submitted applications for NDEA loans, and grants and low interest loans from HEW and HUD for new facilities. They also submitted proposals to OEO for funds to help equalize educational opportunities for the disadvantaged. However, it was Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 that really stimulated most of the proposals from Black colleges because it focused specifically upon "strengthening their academic, administrative and student services." With the exception of financial aid to students, it is still the largest single source of Federal funds for Black colleges.

When administrators of Black colleges discovered that they could strengthen their institutions by securing federal grants, there was a sudden and vigorous involvement in the preparation of proposals. However, it soon became apparent that there were very few persons at any of the institutions who could write an appealing and well-documented proposal focused on the urgent needs of their institutions.

Before the need for a development office became more widely recognized, most of the proposals submitted by Black colleges to both private foundations and federal agencies were prepared by the following:

1. The President of the Institution

   Those Black colleges fortunate enough to have imaginative and aggressive presidents who could express the needs of their institutions in well prepared applications and proposals

soon began to feel the impact of federal funds resulting from numerous unilateral, bilateral and cooperative arrangements. There were some presidents, especially in state supported institutions, who were somewhat reluctant to seek federal programmatic funds because they felt their institutions could not continue the programs when federal funds were no longer available (usually three years).

Most private black colleges, however, welcomed the opportunity to strengthen themselves in this way. It was their feeling that even though the federal funds may be temporary, they would meet some immediate urgent needs while the institution was seeking to broaden its financial base with well-planned development programs. Whatever the philosophy of the president was about the use of Federal funds, the point we are stressing here is that he not only made the contacts with the agencies, foundations, and presidents of collaborating institutions, both black and white, but that in most cases actually WROTE the proposals himself.

2. Proposal Writing Consultants

There were some presidents of Black colleges who wanted to secure Federal support and had some good ideas for strengthening their institutions but lacked either the time or the technical skill to write a proposal. To fully understand this situation, we have to recall that prior to 1968 many black college presidents did not have the administrative staff they have now. Not only was he the president of the institution, but in addition, because of budget restraints, he had to function as director of development, director of institutional research and long-range planning, and director of public relations. Because of the immensity of his task as chief administrator and the lack of expertise in writing proposals, the president frequently contacted a proposal writing consultant firm to recommend a person, or contacted someone he already knew with a proven "track record" to visit the college for a briefing session and then prepare a rough draft of a proposal for his perusal and suggestions. After this first step was taken the consultant would then prepare the final draft and the proposal was submitted to a Federal agency,

foundation, or corporation for consideration. However, there were two disadvantages to this method:

(a) If the proposal was not funded, the institution would lose the fee (sometimes ranging between $500-$1,000) paid the consultant.

(b) This method developed no expertise within the college itself. It was still dependent upon the outside consultants for the preparation of proposals.

3. Faculty or Staff Member

Realizing the disadvantages of using proposal writing consultants, some college presidents began to identify key faculty or staff members who were interested and willing to sharpen their skills in proposal writing. Some were recruited from English departments because of their ability to write with clarity, but it did not really matter what the discipline of the individual was as long as this new assignment was accepted willingly and the individual had the basic qualifications. Fortunately, while some presidents were searching for staff and faculty members to engage in the preparation of proposals, the Phelps-Stokes Fund, under the leadership of Dr. F.D. Patterson and assisted by the Sloan Foundation, began a program to train development officers. Interested colleges were invited to send prospective development officers to seminars and workshops for special training in this area. Then consortial arrangements to enable these colleges to get funds from the Division of College Support (Title III, Developing Institutions), to help underwrite the cost of establishing a development office on each campus were made while this special training was continued by the Moton Memorial Institute, Inc. and the Phelps-Stokes Fund.

While it is difficult if not impossible to make a generalization about the progress of all Black colleges in the area of development, it is not too presumptious to state that between 1965 and 1972 the responsibility for proposal preparation in most colleges moved from the president's office to the development office. It is true that some black colleges are still in that first stage and others are in transition. Of the 83 colleges served by the Moton College Service Bureau approximately thirty-four have full-time, trained

development officers. This may suggest to some observers that we should wait until all Black colleges establish a development office before suggesting another dimension of proposal development. However, since the colleges we are serving are in different stages of development themselves, MCSB is now undertaking a new approach to proposal preparation. We are pleased that it is moving from the president's office to the development office. However, moving the responsibility from one office to another is not enough. Proposal preparation now must become an INSTITUTIONAL rather than an INDIVIDUAL function. This does NOT mean that an individual may not write a proposal. It does mean that the in-put comes from other interested and involved persons. It also means that the preparation of proposals must take on these added considerations:

(1) They must flow from the institutions' objectives and commitment. Searching hap-hazardly for programs which do not relate to the mission of the institution is unwise and self-defeating. Even if the program has top priority nationally, an institution should not seek to undertake what it cannot implement. Neither should it engage in programs it has the resources and capability to implement if the institution is not fully committed to them. Very recently some of our member colleges used the following procedures in helping to determine what proposals they would prepare.
   (a) A small number of the staff and faculty spent a week at a remote retreat to take a closer look at the institution's philosophy, objectives, goals and mission.
   (b) After reaching an agreement on these basic aspects of their institutions, they proceeded to list programs which would implement these objectives and goals.
   (c) They then proceeded to identify those programs with highest priority.
   (d) The group then began to identify sources of financial assistance.
   (e) Only then were proposals prepared for submission to prospective funding sources.

This sequence of planning activities may not be necessary for all colleges but it does illustrate what the institution needs to do before preparing a proposal.

(2) These proposals should include in-put from those who will be expected to implement the program. The business manager, director of development, federal relations officer, and any other faculty and/or staff member who is directly or indirectly related to the program described in the proposal should be involved. One distinct advantage of this procedure is that it prevents a single individual from pushing a proposal in which he has a personal interest but is not related to the college's mission. The Moton College Service Bureau is so convinced of the importance of this approach that it has changed its format in training individuals to prepare proposals. We no longer limit ourselves to the "cluster concept" where colleges in close proximity to each other are invited to send faculty and staff members to a workshop to improve their proposal writing skills. We now send a team of three to each campus to work with one institution at a time. Sometimes we have as many as three teams working simultaneously. This procedure has several advantages:
   (a) We can focus upon special needs and priorities of that institution.
   (b) The contributions of all involved in the process may be coordinated. This provides a good example of the need for a coordinator after our team leaves.
   (c) There is more in-put from faculty and staff.
   (d) We can identify sources of support and assist with proposals the college is planning to submit rather than deal with "hypothetical" proposals.

(3) Proposals to Federal agencies should be delegated to a federal relations officer.

Elsewhere in this publication the role and responsibilities of the FRO are discussed in detail by other contributors. It is not the intention of this writer to elaborate on this aspect of Federal funding. However,

there are at least four inescapable conclusions to be drawn from what has been written about the functions of the FRO:

(a) Institutional coordination of proposal preparation, especially those submitted to federal agencies, will not occur unless this responsibility is delegated to a FRO or someone who will serve as a Coordinator of Federal Relations. The Director of Development has the responsibility of extending this to ALL proposals including foundations, corporations, individuals and other sourses of support. This approach avoids unnecessary duplication of effort.

(b) Institutional coordination of proposal preparation requires a longer time span. Those which are submitted at the last minute to meet a deadline cannot be properly reviewed by all persons involved. Proposals from individual faculty members usually have to be referred to the Department Head or Divisional Chairman, the Dean of Instruction, the Federal Relations Officer, the Director of Development, the Business Manager and the President before it is finally submitted.

(c) There can be no effective coordination of proposal preparation unless there is a constant and direct flow of information to all faculty and staff members who have any responsibility for the preparation of proposals or implementation of programs. It is absolutely imperative that lines of communication be kept open and regular meetings held. The Moton College Service Bureau sends frequent memoranda containing information about federal programs, deadlines, budgets, and legislation to presidents, deans, directors of development and federal relations officers. However, it is the responsibility of these officers to see that this information reaches the appropriate faculty and/or staff members.

(d) With the competition for the Federal dollar as keen as it is and Federal funding for higher education

declining, the institutions which have not learned to coordinate the preparation of their proposals will find themselves in a very unfavorable position.

The Federal agencies are taking a long hard look at all requests for funds to see the extent to which the institutions are really committed to the program and have the capacity to implement them. If the program is adequately coordinated, this will be obvious not only to Federal agencies but to foundations and corporations as well.

Proposal preparation at most Black colleges has moved from the president's office to the offices of the director of development and federal relations. While neither of these officers may actually write the proposals, it is his responsibility to see that they are properly prepared and submitted on time.

During the past year and a half the Moton College Service Bureau has sponsored-on campus workshops and seminars on proposal preparation. In addition to the special emphasis placed upon faculty and staff involvement and institutional coordination, the Bureau also stressed the importance of increasing the number and improving the quality of the proposals which member institutions submit to federal agencies. The Moton College Service Bureau feels that these are essential prerequisities if black colleges are to get a larger share of Federal funds. A recent survey of the eighty-three member institutions made by MCSB has substantiated this belief. The fifty-four (54) institutions that responded indicated that the Federal funds which they received increased from $79,956,968 in 1971-72 to $100,323,182 in 1972-73. This is an increase of $20,366,196 or 23% in one year. A more detailed analysis of this survey appears in a MCSB publication entitled "A Summary of Federal Support to Fifty-four Black Institutions." However, it is encouraging to note that the proposal writing efforts of MCSB have already had a significant impact upon black colleges.

ROLE OF THE FEDERAL RELATIONS OFFICER

It is obviously impossible to specify any precise pattern of duties and responsibilities that will describe the jobs of all federal relations officers, or to prescribe any specifications for the FRO in a "model" college or university administration. The size of the institution and the form of administration under which it operates affect the nature and scope of the FRO's duties, and added to these influences are such factors as state laws, and state university policies, all of which help to determine his role in the administrative setup.

In order to give as specific a framework as possible for this discussion, it is necessary that we understand that the position of federal relations officer in the traditionally Black college is relatively new. In fact only a handful of these institutions reported a staff person who spent a substantial portion of his time involved in Federal relations. Even then, most of these individuals assumed this responsibility primarily because of a singular involvement in one of the existing Federal programs, i.e. Director of Title III, Director of Upward Bound, etc. Consequently, very few of them were prepared or trained to function effectively as a federal relations officer whose primary responsibility consisted of coordinating all Federal activities at the institution.

Dual Role of the Federal Relations Officer

At the outset of this analysis of the role of the federal relations officer, then, attention should be directed to this dual nature of his present position in most of our institutions. Our most recent survey reveals that approximately twenty of the eighty-three institutions participating in the Moton College Service Bureau Program employ full-time FROs. This means that several of our institutions have recently recognized the importance of having a full-time person who devotes his energies and talents to the aggressive pursuit of the Federal dollar.

However, the majority of our institutions have not found it feasible to appoint or employ someone to function solely in this capacity. In most instances. the reason given is the added strain on an already woefully inadequate budget. It is interesting to note, however,

that those institutions that report full-time federal relations officers also report the largest amount of Federal funds received from grants and contracts. No analysis has been attempted to ascertain which development preceded the other. However, there does appear to be a direct relationship between the amount of time an officer of the college spends in the pursuit of Federal funds and the amount of funds the institution receives.

Consequently, most federal relations officers wear two or more hats. In some instances he is a department head to whom certain responsibilities and functions have been delegated. Sometimes he is a full-time faculty member, teaching three or four courses and at the same time serving as the Director of Title III. In still another instance he is a managerial aide to the president of the institution and has numerous other responsibilities, including making personal appearances for the president, serving as the chief administrator in the president's absence, and meeting and receiving important guests of the institution.

One of the first official requests of the Moton College Service Bureau was to ask each president to appoint a federal relations officer. This person would serve as the contact person on each campus and provide liasion between the institution and the services of the Bureau. Most college administrators responded favorably to this request. The person named ranged from a full-time Federal grants administrator to a full-time faculty member who assumed this additional responsibility. In some instances, the development officer was asked to coordinate all Federal efforts at institutional level. It is heartening to note, however, that a substantial number of our institutions have come to recognize the necessity of staffing this office with a full-time professional and are moving in that direction.

Duties and Responsibilities

It was recognized at the outset that these officers would need training if they were to function effectively. Several workshops were held, both group and individual, to delineate the role and function of the federal relations officer and to provide experiences essential to gaining insight into the whole area of grantmanship.

Specifically, the role of the federal relations officer can be divided into two main areas. The institutional role consists of all of those activities performed at institutional level. The advocacy role

relates to his outside contacts with the various agencies and arms of the Federal establishment.

Institutional Duties and Responsibilities

1. The federal relations officer serves as a coordinator of all Federal programs and grants at the institution. In this role, he reviews all proposals to Federal agencies and assures that all commitments are in compliance with institutional policy. He maintains a central file on all requests and keeps a copy of each proposal on file.
2. He serves as a resource person to other administrators and faculty on Federal programs. In this connection he meets with the Academic Council, Administrative Council and other key decision-making bodies on the campus. His role is to provide information regarding new Federal initiatives, funding possibilities, and other relevant information and ideas.
3. He stimulates proposal activity in the faculty and administration. Small committee meetings and individual sessions are held with various administrators and faculty members in an effort to inspire them to write proposals to be submitted for support. In some instances, it may be of merit to attend the meetings of the entire faculty in a resource capacity.
4. He assists faculty members and administrators in drafting proposals for research projects and educational programs. Conversant in the language of proposal writing and equipped with the knowledge and technical skills of successful proposal development, the federal relations officer reviews all proposals and makes suggestions for strengthening the document when applicable.
5. He operates a comprehensive information service for administrators, faculty and student body. He serves as a repository of information on Federal programs, including program announcements, guidelines, application forms, deadlines dates, copies of the appropriate legislation, and names, addresses, and telephone numbers of key contacts in each agency. This information is made available to all constituent groups on a regular basis. In some instances, weekly bulletins have proven to be quite helpful.

6. He publishes a periodic newsletter which keeps the entire campus community informed about appropriation trends, new program possibilities, and recent grants received by the institution.
7. He holds periodic proposal writing workshops in which interested faculty members are instructed in the art of proposal writing. Copies of successful proposals may be made available as "models" and used for instructional purposes.

Advocacy Duties and Responsibilities

1. The federal relations officer makes periodic visits to the offices of the Federal Government, both national and regional. He meets with Federal program officers and other governmental officials in an effort aimed at articulating the needs and capabilities of the institution he represents.
2. He seeks to affiliate himself with national and regional educational associations for the purpose of sharing of information and ideas. He must be ever aware of relationships that serve to strengthen the case for his institution.
3. He keeps informed of legislative and appropriations actions that have significance for higher education in general and his own institution in particular.
4. He aggressively pursues the possibility of membership on guidelines committees, task forces, and other ad hoc groups that make important decisions about Federal program requirements and funds allocations.
5. When necessary, he represents the president of the institution at meetings and conferences where any discussion of Federal funds is involved.

The present fiscal austerity facing our nation's colleges, combined with the fact that more of our youngsters are seeking post high school training, make the competition for funds extremely difficult. The federal relations officer's role must be clearly defined if he is to function adequately.

THE FEDERAL RELATIONS OFFICER AND ACADEMIC PLANNING

It goes without saying that one of the things that is sadly needed in a great many of our Black institutions is the development of an over-all educational plan for the various parts of the institution. The reasons for this lack of program development are many and diverse, not the least of which is the fact that the absence of a solid support base has forced administrators and faculty members to spend their time in pursuit of federal and private sponsorship of interrelated program elements.

Additionally, the development of an over-all educational plan requires a substantial time involvement and a series of priority judgments that express a clear relationship between the various aspects of a program, giving some indication of the relative importance of each. This process involves a series of judgments, sometimes unpleasant, in order to have a clear understanding of where the institution is headed. It is unfortunate that many faculty members at Black institutions are forced to proceed under the assumption that at some time in the vague past a general educational plan has been laid down. They have read statements of institutional philosophy and objectives that appear in the college catalogue and other official documents of the institution but rarely have they debated, in deliberate assembly, those objectives and philosophies in an attempt to shape the academic future of the institution. It is too often assumed that the present offerings, departmental and division structures, and course sequences have been developed on some rational basis and that these have, in themselves, and because of the accident of history, a certain validity.

The real truth of the matter is that in most instances the institution, including the various departments, the course offerings, and the various other academic activities, has grown in a very unregulated fashion, and that the present state of affairs represents rather the degree of lack of clarity than any rational valid plan. The lack of any plan of this kind has resulted, in several instances, in a complete distortion of the normal balance between fields of work; a distortion which most of the administrative staff and faculty would not have agreed to, had there been any discussion to this point. The net result has been that some of the academic subject matter departments of considerable importance have been allowed to languish, or to stand still, partly because of a

relative lack of push from the department heads and faculty members. In one institution, a relatively unimportant service department demanded and received consideration from limited resources for additional personnel and course development because of the aggressive nature of the departmental chairman.

Faculty

The key element in the development of an over-all educational plan for the academic process in an academic community is the faculty. There is no other justification for a college or a university except to enable the faculty to carry on its instructional and research activities. Perhaps no profession – not even law or medicine – leaves so much determination of effort entirely in the hands of the faculty. In most institutions, the decisions regarding academic programs, addition of new curricular offerings, and even course content rest solely with the faculty. The Dean of Academic Affairs is charged with the responsibility of orchestrating this activity.

Every member of the faculty recognizes that he has a dual status. He has an individual role and a collegial role. As an individual a faculty member has various important duties to carry out in the performance of his profession. In addition, each member of a faculty has certain duties to perform as a part of a company of scholars. While some individuals tend to have more influence than others, (Black colleges are not unique in this regard) every faculty member has some voice in the determination of matters of academic policy at all levels of decision making.

At the department level the system for decision making is one of direct democracy. Every person of stated academic rank has an equal voice and vote in the realization of collective action. At the college or university level the system for decision making may be either direct or representative. The faculty usually meets together as a whole and as an academic senate take appropriate actions affecting the general conduct of educational affairs. In some smaller Black institutions, much of the achievement of an academic concensus rests with committees. Reports from curriculum committees will usually be accepted by the entire faculty membership of a college. The alternative will ordinarily be no decision or action at all. In their collective capacity a college faculty will criticize committee reports, occasionally modify a provision of general interest, or even move to recommit some matter for further

committee deliberation. In these respects a college faculty is much like a legislative chamber as a whole.

Departments and Divisions

In most Black colleges, the customary first grouping of faculty members is the department. It is here that all persons with a common subject-matter interest are brought together. Under the guidance or leadership of a chairman or executive officer, each department has a number of vital decisions to make. Ordinarily it is the department as a group which decides the general scope and specialization of subject matter to be undertaken in the course offerings. It ordinarily determines both what courses it shall offer to its students and what sequence and number of courses shall be required for a major. It is at this level that recommendations for new course offerings and additional personnel are likely to emanate. Both have implications for additional funds. These decisions, of course, are subject to review at faculty level.

In several instances, the various departments are organized into divisions, a grouping of related departments. This structure is prevalent in several Black institutions for purposes that do not fall within the purview of this paper. Suffice it to say that this arrangement creates another level of decision making in long-range academic planning. Division chairmen and departmental heads are administratively responsible to the Dean of Academic Affairs.

The College or University

The point of view of the college or university as a whole in academic planning is represented by the faculty as a whole and by its leadership. The president and his chief academic officer usually work closely with the department and division heads who form the Academic Council. This is the group that is apt to make the final decisions regarding educational plans. The assumption here is that this body is in effect an educational council where major issues of educational policy and procedure are resolved, subject to faculty approval and support.

Through the process I have just described, it is possible for a college or university to develop an over-all educational plan. The advantages are obvious. In the first place, the plan would supply basic information for a great many budget decisions and would allow an intelligent examination of these questions consistent with the major

purposes of the institution. Secondly, it develops a clear concept of the major purposes of the institution, around which it is possible to gather the loyalty and enthusiasm of most of the faculty and staff.

I have alluded to the primary reason why administrative officials in Black institutions feel that they do not have enough time to carry on the kind of discussions suggested here. They are, it is true, so busy with problems calling for immediate decisions that they are unable to spend the time required to arrive at an over-all educational plan. A large percentage of the decisions that they are forced to make are financial in nature. Actually, even the simplest kind of budgetary decision involves a clear-cut educational preference or priority in order to be made at all.

The Federal Relations Officer

The development of an over-all educational plan obviously will reflect these priorities as new ideas for programs, additional personnel, and physical plans of development are projected. Resource development must proceed simultaneously if the plans are to be successful. Consequently, the federal relations officer assumes a role of immense importance in the planning and development process. He should be knowledgeable of the possibilities of Federal support for programs and intimately involved in the aggressive pursuit of these funds. He can serve as a resource person to faculty, department and division chairmen, academic deans, and the president in interpreting Federal funding trends, explaining program limitations, securing and interpreting Federal guidelines, and developing proposals. His intimate, first hand knowledge of Federal agencies and his keen understanding of the workings of the bureaucracy should prove invaluable to administrators and faculty members who are looking for support sources for program development.

Quite often academic planning is undertaken without serious consideration being given to national patterns that develop, which inevitably influence national policy decisions regarding support to education. I am not suggesting that Black institutions should shape their programs to match Federal funding priorities. I am saying, however, that a knowledge of existing patterns and possible programs are essential for realistic academic planning. The federal relations officer who is knowledgeable about national priority patterns and funding trends should regularly provide interpretive information to

administrators and faculty. This can be done through occasional memoranda and participation in departmental, division and faculty meetings. It seems to me that this kind of information is essential to the Academic Council for effective decision making.

The recent trend toward decentralization and revenue sharing has added a significantly new dimension to the federal relations officer's role. Information regarding funds for development of academic programs must be ascertained from the regional, state, and local level. Relationships must be developed at another level of decision making and Black college administrators and faculty members must become increasingly aware of the routes for pursuit of these funds. The creation of statewide coordinating boards has compounded the problems. Since they are empowered to plan for the orderly development of the whole of higher education in the state, their influence cannot be overlooked.

The federal relations officer is in a unique position to provide information and guidance to the entire academic community as he expands his range of contacts with the Federal, regional, state, and local agencies.

THE FEDERAL RELATIONS OFFICER AS ADVOCATE

Anyone seeking to give advice in an area of great misunderstanding and much folklore, such as the proper posture to take as a college FRO towards the Federal government, invariably can be likened to the gentlemen who were Charles II's physicians, in England several hundred years ago. These experts, and consultants did the following: "They bled him. They blistered him from head to foot with hot metal. They gave him purge after purge, using, among other medicants, a salt extracted from human skulls. They made him inhale powder to induce sneezing. While this was going on, they fed him broth laced with cream of tartar and a light ale brewed without hops. When he complained of his discomforts (mildly, for he was a polite and considerate man), the doctors strictly bade him be silent – a milestone, perhaps, in the march of the experts to domination over sovereignty. After a few days, mercifully, Charles died. Nobody could accuse the doctors of underestimating his sickness (probably cerebral hemorrhage) or of timidity in their prescriptions."

The job of the FRO is difficult enough without some persuasive and "remote" expert handing out bromides that may not work. Unfortunately, I will not be different from that mold; I will attempt to raise certain issues that will obtain, regardless of what the fiscal crunch will be, and regardless of what agency of the national government the FRO will be dealing with. In large measure, you will find that I have not-so-much answered questions or raised all questions, but perhaps have raised some better questions for you to ask in the performance of your duties as FROs, and suggested a yardstick against which you can measure your success or lack of it as the "FRO as Advocate".

The objective of effective advocacy is to position your institution so as to make it a force to be reckoned with in decision-making on programs and priorities. It means a network of people at all levels that you can reach for information or influence, and the absolute performance of tasks (especially small administrative tasks, and some social tasks) that will add credibility and integrity to your being so positioned. It also means knowledge of the "Federal System" and its functionaries. Advocacy in a word is people.

Let us start by giving our list of "advocacy check points". You can't begin to know Washington and its agencies without five things:

1. A government operations manual.
2. An organization chart of any and every agency you are trying to penetrate.
3. A telephone directory and a regional directory of that agency.
4. A set of the major legislation or program documents of the target agency. (Or other public information documents)
5. A Guide to Federal Domestic Assistance.

What is important to remember is that power in Washington is based on interlocking relationships and not on title per se. A special assistant to the Commissioner of Education may be more important in positioning your school, than a branch or bureau chief. Who a person reports to is more important than who reports to him.

Ideally, the advocate would like his institution to be considered before yearly priorities are set, before guidelines are selected, and before the public is informed. The advocate is after lead time, the more advance warning he has on trends, the better. If you hear me suggesting the FRO cannot do his job flying a desk, you are reading me clearly. But "desk-work" is preparatory and necessary. Part of desk work is access to information officers or specialists whose jobs are to tell what an agency is about. You as a FRO need to be on a mailing list for target agencies.

In each agency you are dealing with fine, honest, contact people. By this I mean, someone you can get to, someone who will tell you what is "new," what is unfashionable now (yes Virginia, there are fads and fashions in education), and what the future laundry list is for your target agency or what it is likely to be. This may be an intern, a secretary, a low-level or high-level staffer, or anyone whom you can call and get the truth. Which leads me to the touch stone of all advocacy.

It is important to build a network of friends, acquaintances and "grunts" with people that will always return your calls and who will keep your confidence and your school in mind. It does no good what so ever to call when you have a burning problem like "Will my Cosip D fly?" or "Where is my Drug Abuse Proposal?", if you have not sufficiently regularized your relationship with the party you are calling, these attempts are not likely to be successful.

Don't hesitate to say to one member of your network "Whom do you know at so-and-so?" or "Met a good man in OZQ that you need to

know". The people you deal with in D.C. got where they are because of their network and stay current by enlarging their network, and, true enough, by enlarging upon your network.

The Government Operations Manual will help you understand titles and positions of people. They are very deceptive. The organization chart will place people in boxes, and will give you an idea of the path of decision-making. The telephone directory will connect you with the name in the box (work on the telephone technique) and the legislation, major program guides, and publications will make you fluent in the agencies special language or buzz words.

But even if you know title, rank (G.S. Grade), and critical path, all this may be upset by a new man in the "top slot" or a well-seasoned, better connected bureaucrat, lower down, who can move your program or hold it up at his level. Who government people fear is more revealing than who they report to or respect.

Moving on back through the above advocacy checklist, the small things mean more at first than the large. Always write notes of thanks to the person taking your calls or being of help. From time-to-time (but not so soon or too frequently) send a note topside, with a blind copy to your contact, lauding a special kindness. Always be prompt, to the day or at worst, the week, in responding to any request from them. Be a critical booster of your school, its proposals and their execution. It's a refreshing change. Regardless to the size of the grant or program, whether required or not, you should personally make periodic reports on the program, and conversely make sure the project director or responsible persons are never late in submitting reports.

In short, you and your school must have the reputation of a trouble-free relationship with your co[illegible]cts. It is an old maxim that money goes to who you know first, and [illegible]econd, who will not embarrass you before your friends. Be available to serve on visitation groups, panels, guidelines committees, etc. – and don't hesitate to spread these opportunities in your school, or even turn a few down that don't fit or that are counter productive. In short, cement your network with performance and alacrity in all matters.

One would suppose there will be no advocacy without a sure knowledge of what one is advocating. Unfortunately, many schools have not set their internal priorities in such a way as to assure effective advocacy. What do you want and who is buying is almost the first question. An institution needs to make a self-evaluation related to what

it is doing now, what under-used capabilities it has by department and by seasons of the year, what programs it cannot participate in (matching, no competence, no appetite), what its students' appetites are, its teaching reform, its faculty growth, its instructional resources, its administration, and its special target populations. To paraphrase Alice in Wonderland and George Bernard Shaw, if you don't know where you are going, any road will take you there.

Once your school has determined the priorities, it's wants, then the uniqueness of its need for advocacy is relatively clear. The questions become, Do we have a unique constituency? Are we peculiarly situated? Can we reach out and muster support locally, statewide, regionally? Have we a special expertise? Does our locale (near wet lands, on the sea, in the city, etc.) give us a residual expertise not readily apparent? Have we written an institutional promotional document for general distribution? How important is our institution in reaching a unique group? What has been our success with a student population and its graduate and undergraduate demographics (considering the above)? Is it a greater bargain to fund our program than some other?

The FRO as advocate becomes at once strategist in planning, tactician in pulling all the elements together for a particular point, and synthesizer of the proper moment to broaden the institution's fiscal base.

A point not to be overlooked! Most FROs learn one tune called the U.S.O.E. Waltz on one instrument. There are other tunes in town, even whose orchestras! Don't just keal with HEW, USOE, NSF and NIH. Penetrate new agencies, broaden your base.

The FRO is not to be as Charles II's physicians, trying every nostrum. He is rather a specialist, who determines his tools, gives proper diagnosis and builds his remedy soundly. In short, he is the Advocate: "To speak in favor of, to recommend publicity, to plead and argue for. He moves his position."

FEDERAL RELATIONS OFFICE MANAGEMENT AND RECORDS

There is a popular song which says, "Everything is beautiful in its own way." There is a way in which federal relations at a college or university can be beautiful. Our purpose here is to propose that possibility. Our intent, however, is to deal only with good management procedures for a federal relations office. Accordingly, we shall define the scope and function of the office, develop a structure of key operations looked at in the light of its basic responsibilities, and suggest a useful record system for implementing its work.

Setting Up the Office. First of all, some person at each institution should be designated as the federal relations officer. The functions of the office revolve around him. He should serve in that capacity full-time for the larger colleges or universities; and for the small schools, at least half-time.

But according to common practice we have encountered in dealing with eighty-three schools affiliated with TACTICS, this officer often wears more than one hat and is referred to variously as, federal liaison officer, coordinator of grants and special projects, Title III coordinator, director of research and grants, director of planning and sponsored projects, director of federal relations, administrative assistant to the president, or director of development. In some instances he is the academic dean. Our major concern, however, is not with the person's title but with his functions as an officer exclusively or primarily devoted to the quest for Federal funds.

For the person newly appointed to his job and endeavoring to set up his office, we suggest the six steps below as a highly recommended procedure. If, however, he has established his office already he will find in this pattern of actions a rewarding measurement by which to evaluate his own efforts and experience.

STEP ONE: Review Your Institution's Grant Program.

1. List all grants for the current and two previous years and analyze the extent of your school's involvement in Federal assistance. Study the prospects for expansion. Note especially those areas where no proposals have developed.

2. List and file copies of all proposals at your institution. If they have not been filed at a central place, collect copies from program directors and duplicate if necessary to begin a central file.
3. List the names and record the academic vitae of all program and project directors, for the current and two previous years.

STEP TWO: Assemble a Federal Reference Library.

1. Secure the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance, the Catalog of Federal Education Assistance Programs, and other basic reference materials listed by Mrs. Ernestine Knight.
2. Secure guidelines, copies of legislation, and other information pieces pertaining to specific federal programs and make them available for faculty use in a convenient location.

STEP THREE: Set Up an Office, Staff, and Budget.

1. Secure adequate space, accessible to the campus community, find a competent, full-time secretary, and arrange for office equipment and supplies commensurate with a full time operation.
2. Arrange for Xerox or some other copying service either in your own office or jointly with another. Also, arrange for MT/ST or some similar multiple typing service.
3. Analyze fully your travel needs and set up sufficient coverage.

STEP FOUR: Set up a Plan for Internal Coordination.

1. Seek and secure administrative approval for a plan whereby the federal relations office will be recognized on the campus as the clearing house for all proposal activity directed toward the Federal government. Issue a manual of procedures.
2. Formulate a proposal registration procedure and a check list for proposal writers. All proposals should be routed to the federal relations officer as the last station before the president's signature.
3. Secure the appointment of a grants council, composed of key representatives from each department or area likely to apply for Federal support, who will assist you in forming a liaison

with Federal agencies and deliberate with you from time to time on problems connected with institutional proposals and implementation of projects. An invited council selected by you may make the best beginning.

STEP FIVE: Meet With the Faculty.

1. Meet separately with academic departments to gain insights into their problems and desires. Talk informally with individuals.
2. Set up a master file to locate possible funding sources by subject-matter areas. Your entries should include potential funding possibilities, and should include cards referring to opportunities spelled out in basic agency information materials.

STEP SIX: Visit Washington, D.C.

1. Call at Moton College Service Bureau offices.
2. Secure appointments with a few agency officials, especially program officers. Learn from them how they like to see their programs operate; let them know about you institution; place your name on as many mailing lists as you can.

Responsibilities and Opportunities. The federal relations officer on a college or university campus functions to coordinate grants, operate an information center, maintain liaison with federal agencies, stimulate faculty activity in research and special projects, enforce regulations pertaining to conflicts of interest in local situations, and represent the president at meetings and conferences with Federal and state agencies.

Fundamentally, he is not charged with the responsibility of writing proposals himself but with pulling together the efforts of others. His job is conditioned by his ability to get relevant faculty and staff mobilized to draft a proposal. Thus, his total effectiveness will be enhanced proportionally as he makes a serious effort to form a faculty and staff relationship that facilitates his work.

At an early stage in his office tenure he will seek to associate himself with a faculty council, representing a broad base of institutional support. As his work develops he will formulate a manual of procedures, publish an occasional bulletin or newsletter, conduct proposal writing workshops, and use his annual reports for purposes of

revelation and stimulation. The following paragraphs will describe good management practices for the manual, the bulletin, and the annual report.

The Federal Relations Manual. This is an official document drawn up by the FRO for the guidance and training of his staff and colleagues. It anticipates their need for information on institutional policies and proposal writing, and business procedures in dealing with the Federal government. A typical manual, as developed by Dr. Calvin Atchinson at Tennessee State University, reflects the chronological sequence of submitting a proposal, conducting a project, and closing the project account. The contents are as follows:

1. Introduction: A statement on the aim and purpose of the Manual, and to the effect that the institution encourages the expansion of programs supported by Federal funds.
2. The institution's research policies
3. Institutional organization for the administration of research and special projects
4. Preparing a proposal for outside funds
5. Processing the proposal
6. Initiating the project
7. Conducting the project
8. Closing the project account

The Bulletin or Newsletter. If attractively designed and carefully written, this instrument can be a valuable component of the federal relations program. It will be published consistently, as often as something of interest should be communicated to the campus. It will contain as regular features, brief notices about Federal legislation or agency announcements of programs, alerts concerning proposal deadlines, local news from projects in operation, and official directives. It can take any format that lends itself to an acceptable response from the campus community.

The Annual Report. At the end of a given year the FRO's records should enable him to write a comprehensive report, analyzing and evaluating the special programs and projects having received Federal support at his institution. This report should be educational as well as a collection of facts and figures; it should be used for purposes of

stimulating faculty and staff and circulated to the administration, faculty and students, and to the respective funding agencies involved.

Among other things, it should provide answers for certain questions basic to a developing institution, that in a measure tend to state its case: — How many facets of institutional life at the college have been subsidized by Federal grants? To what extent has the existence of special support programs enhanced its overall posture as a viable and much-needed educational enterprise? How has increased federal funding affected it in its range of activities and in important changes? The following suggested outline for a typical annual report has been adapted from one developed by Dr. John S. Lash at Texas Southern University:

1. Introduction: — A general statement taking note of the different aspects of institutional life affected by the presence of Federal special programs, the total amount of money for each, and the significance of these programs for higher education.

   Also, an explanatory note on the place and function of the federal relations office on campus and a resume of its activities is included.
2. Overview and listing of programs in operation relevant to target groups
3. Summary sketch of each individual program, personnel, eligibility requirements and program emphases
4. Projection on programs for the next fiscal year
5. Significant comment or recommendations from program or project directors
6. Recommendations of the federal relations officer

Office Files. Beside providing storage for day-to-day correspondence, cumulative memoranda, and sundry items relating to business, the federal relations office files can deliver an invaluable service to prospective proposal writers through its organized system of deposited information. Such a system will contain documentary materials assembled for the purpose of delivering factual data frequently required for enabling individuals to become knowledgeable about their institutions that can be readily passed on to those who need it without delay. The organizational scheme for such materials is as follows:

A. Materials Pertaining to Educational and General Operations
   1. A copy of the institution's fiscal budget
   2. A list of sources from which the school receives its major support
   3. The college president's annual report
   4. Governance Board (Trustee Board) approved plans
   5. Manuals, guidelines, or policy statements for:
      a. Institutional research
      b. Receiving and acknowledging external funds
      c. Inter-office communication
      d. Obligating the college through commitments

B. Materials Concerning Programs and Costs
   1. Current and pending proposals
   2. Sponsored projects reports
   3. Fugitive reports and plans obtained from other institutions
   4. The college's long-range plan

C. Data Pertaining to Characteristics of the College
   1. The college catalog
   2. Academic deans, faculty, and committee reports
   3. Reports on student services
   4. Copies of all printed brochures and mailing pieces
   5. Copies of all press releases

D. Data Pertaining to Institutional Personnel
   1. Students:
      a. Numbers (in various categories)
      b. Georgraphic spread
      c. Financial background
      d. Ratio of graduates to entrants
      e. Increases or decreases over previous years
   2. Alumni:
      a. Current locations
      b. Social visibility
      c. Vocational pursuits
      d. Prominent successes
      e. Public service records
      f. Vital statistics

3. Faculty:
    a. Academic resumés
    b. Publications
    c. Public service in the community and at-large
    d. Awards and distinctions
    e. Special academic programs or projects
4. Institutional history:
    a. Accurate data on origins
    b. Significant times and dates
    c. Significant personalities and their involvements
    d. Noteworthy advances by the institution
    e. Significant education innovations
    f. Accurate location of historical documents

Forms and Records. The federal relations officer wishing to review his institution's grant program can see the whole picture at once by using Form 01-100 (Appendix A), Target Areas for Federal Funding. It displays the spread of sponsored projects and special support programs within the institution and the amounts of money made available to it over a period of several years. The programs and projects listed on this particular form are those common to the majority of developing colleges and universities.

The Check List for Preparing Proposals, Form 02-100 (Appendix B), is designed to guide faculty members in covering sufficiently all details as they develop proposals, and to assist administrators, deans, and department heads in evaluating the educational and budgetary aspects. As the person preparing the proposal gathers his preliminary data, he will need to touch base with other persons who are in charge of certain facilities and administrative responsibilities. His aim is to gain clearance from them, or to alert them on pending use of facilities or personnel or physical changes to be made and to attest by initials and/or signatures that all necessary internal approvals have been secured.

When the Check List has been completed the FRO is the last person to sign before the president gives his approval. At this time the FRO will give the proposal a number for future reference. A simple numbering system, for example, might consist of the numerical sequence of the proposal as received in the federal relations office plus

the month of the year and school session (as 6-9-7273 represents the sixth proposal, September, 1972-1973). A more elaborate system might include digits designating year, month, and department, as well as basic serial digits.

Form 03-100 (Appendix C), Program Proposal, can be used to record its basic ideas in brief and all the pertinent facts about it. When the originator of a proposal presents it to the federal relations office he will present at the same time four copies of this form. It can be punched for enclosure and convenient reference in a three ring binder. The binder can be tab-indexed for easy handling.

Form 04-100 (Appendix D), Proposal Register, represents a sample of loose-leaf entries that can be kept in a post-binder as a permanent record of proposals and projects over the years. It tabulates the following data: 1) date of entry; 2) proposal number; 3) amount of funding; 4) proposal title; 5) funding agency; 6) agency officer; 7) project director; 8) academic department; 9) total staff; 10) total clients; 11) duration of project; 12) date of final report; 13) federal relations officer; 14) remarks. The Register should never be removed from the federal relations office.

Form 05-100 (Appendix E), Proposal File Card, represents a 4 x 6 card that can be used to summarize information about a proposal on a continuing basis. It is a more or less temporary "vest-pocket" memorandum that can be carried on a trip or to a committee meeting. Several cards (in different colors) can be entered into the file for the same proposal (which will permit noting changes in condition or new information).

Form 06-100 (Appendix F), Federal Agencies Cleared for Contact, is designed to aid federal relations officers in setting up a master file locating possible funding souces for subject-matter areas. It is a list of potential agencies to which a particular academic area might submit a proposal. When compiled fully, the information can be transferred to a card file for the office and copies of the sheets distributed to the faculty.

Form 07-100 (Appendix G), Federal Assistance Report, will provide the FRO with a practical working paper for bringing together the date he will use in developing narrative for his annual report. Answers to the various questions can be secured from individual program reports and conferences with project directors.

FEDERAL RESOURCES INFORMATION

In this section we will discuss federal resources available to institutons of higher learning for educational programs and projects, and material aid for those endeavoring to establish contact with the Federal Government in search of Federal funds. We are speaking of federal resources in the form of legislation and available funds.

According to the Federal Interagency Committee on Education, in the fiscal year 1970, the Federal Government spent $3.668 billion to aid colleges and universities throughout the nation. Of this amount $125.5 million went to traditionally Black colleges—a mere 3.4 percent. These funds were dispensed through 18 Federal agencies, with the Office of education within the Department of Health, Education and Welfare accounting for 68 percent of all Federal aid to Black Institutions.

From whatever source, Federal funds for higher education are consistently available in the form of grants and awards for student assistance, institutional assistance, research and demonstration projects, facilities improvement, faculty and staff improvement, curriculum improvement, and specialized training of personnel to perform services in the national interest.

The prime requirement for successful operation of a good federal relations program is the federal reference library made available to faculty and staff, at a convenient location on the college or university campus. Any college or university seeking Federal grants should establish on its own campus a reference library of materials that include the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance, copies of Federal legislation in reference to various programs, and guidelines for specific programs as determined by the individual agencies. These are aids that enable those seeking Federal support to match their ideas with possible sources of funds, and to acquire information on current trends in the area of Federal grantsmanship.

The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance is compiled for the Executive Office of the President by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget, and is obtainable from the Government Printing Office or by writing your Congressman for a copy. The purpose of the Catalog is to aid potential beneficiaries in identifying types of assistance available and how they may obtain it. Each program is described in terms of an

identifying number, the specific type of assistance covered, for what purposes it is available, who can apply for it and how they should apply. In addition, the authorizing legislation, fiscal appropriation, program accomplishments of the previous year, with the range and average of financial assistance awarded are also included.

Supplementing the Catalog, the reference library should include also such standard publications as College and University Reporter, Higher Education and National Affairs, Education Daily, The Chronicle of Higher Education, Education Trends, and other weekly news bulletins. The following materials are recommended:

1. American School and University
   American School and University
   134 N. 13th Street
   Philadelphia, Pennsylviania 19107
2. Association of American Colleges Bulletin
   Association of American Colleges
   1818 R Street, N.W.
   Washington, D.C. 20009
3. Behavioral Sciences Newsletter for Research Planning
   American Institute for Research in the Behavioral Sciences
   135 North Bellefield Avenue
   Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213
4. The Budget in Brief
   Superintendent of Documents
   U.S. Government Printing Office
   Washington, D.C. 20402
5. CASC Newsletter
   Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges
   One Dupont Circle, Suite 750
   Washington, D.C. 20036
6. Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance
   Superintendent of Documents
   U.S. Government Printing Office
   Washington, D.C. 20402
7. The Chronicle of Higher Education
   The Chronicle of Higher Education
   1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
   Washington, D.C. 20036

8. Circular Letter
   National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges
   One Dupont Circle, Suite 710
   Washington, D.C. 20036
9. College Management
   College Management
   22 West Putnam Avenue
   Greenwich, Connecticut 06830
10. College and University Reporter
    Commerce Clearing House, Inc.
    420 Lexington Avenue
    New York, N. Y. 10017
11. A Compendium of Federal Education Laws: (Update for each Congress)
    Committee on Education and Labor
    U.S. House of Representatives
    Room 2175
    Rayburn House Office Building
    Washington, D.C. 20515
12. Education Daily
    Capitol Publications, Inc.
    Suite G-12
    2423 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
    Washington, D.C. 20007
13. Educational Researcher
    Educational Researcher
    1126 – 16th Street, N.W.
    Washington, D.C. 20036
14. Fact Book: Office of Education Programs
    Superintendent of Documents
    U.S. Government Printing Office
    Washington, D.C. 20402
15. Federal Education Policies, Programs and Proposals: House Document No. 398, 90th Congress (Update for each Congress)
    Committee on Education and Labor
    U.S. House of Representatives
    Room 2175
    Rayburn House Office Building
    Washington, D.C. 20515

16. Federal Register
    Superintendent of Documents
    U.S. Government Printing Office
    Washington, D.C. 20402
17. Fellowships in the Arts and Sciences
    American Council on Education
    One Dupont Circle
    Washington, D.C. 20036
18. Financial Aid for Higher Education
    Superintendent of Documents
    U.S. Government Printing Office
    Washington, D.C. 20402
19. Foundation News
    The Foundation Center
    444 Madison Avenue
    New York, N.Y. 10022
20. Grants-in-Aid and Other Financial Assistance Programs: Health Services and Mental Health Administration
    Superintendent of Documents
    U.S. Government Printing Office
    Washington, D.C. 20402
21 The Guide to Federal Assistance for Education
    Appleton-Century-Crofts
    Education Division
    Meredith Corporation
    440 Park Avenue South
    New York, N.Y. 10016
22. HEW Field Letter
    Office of Field Coordination
    U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
    Washington, D.C. 20201
23. HUD Newsletter
    Superintendent of Documents
    U.S. Government Printing Office
    Washington, D.C. 20402
24. Higher Education and National Affairs
    Publication Division
    American Council on Education
    One Dupont Circle
    Washington, D.C. 20036

25. How the Office of Education Assists College Students and Colleges
    Superintendent of Documents
    U.S. Government Printing Office
    Washington, D.C. 20402
26. Humanities
    National Endowment for the Humanities
    1800 F Street, N.W.
    Washington, D.C. 20402
27. LEEP Administrative Memo
    Academic Assistance and Training Division
    Law Enforcement Education Program
    Law Enforcement Assistance Administration
    Department of Justice
    Washington, D.C. 20530
28. Legislative and Special Analyses
    American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research
    1200 – 17th Street, N.W.
    Washington, D.C. 20036
29. NASA Grant Handbook
    Superintendent of Documents
    U.S. Government Printing Office
    Washington, D.C. 20402
30. NIMH Support Programs
    National Institute of Mental Health
    5454 Wisconsin Avenue
    Chevy Chase, Maryland 20203
31. NSF Guide to Programs
    Superintendent of Documents
    U.S. Government Printing Office
    Washington, D.C. 20402
32. National Patterns of Research and Development Resources: Funds and Manpower in the United States, 1953-1971
    Superintendent of Documents
    U.S. Government Printing Office
    Washington, D.C. 20402

33. Private Funds for Mental Health
    Superintendent of Documents
    U.S. Government Printing Office
    Washington, D.C. 20402
34. Reports on Higher Education: WICHE
    Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education
    P.O. Drawer P
    Boulder, Colorado
35. Research in Education
    Superintendent of Documents
    U.S. Government Printing Office
    Washington, D.C. 20402
36. Washington Newsletter
    American Library Association
    The Coronet
    200 C Street, S.E.
    Washington, D.C. 20003

Research and Liaison. Competition for federal support makes it very, very necessary that each college or university develop an on-campus expert who will be proficient in identifying funding sources. Since within the wide reach of the Federal Government there are more than 1,000 programs, administered by about 60 different administrative departments, independent agencies, commissions, and councils, a mere novice might be confused by where to begin his search for funds. It seldom pays to approach agencies randomly. Most have established programs, providing a specific type of assistance with regard to the purpose of the grant.

Some person on the campus having responsibility for federal relations, and making constant use of the reference library, thoroughly and continuously exploring federal program possibilities, will give his institution a decided advantage in the writing and submitting of proposals. This person ought to become acquainted with federal agency program personnel through periodic visits to their offices for face to face contact as proposals are under consideration. Personal contacts serve also to increase the institution's visibility – which in turn sometimes determines how a proposal is viewed. When no proposal is under consideration, inquiries might be made concerning prospective programs.

A second valuable resource available to member institutions in the Technical Assistance Consortium to Improve College Services (TACTICS) is in maintaining liaison with the federal reference librarian and administrative assistant for research at Moton College Service Bureau. Her major role in supplying services to the colleges and universities is that of surveying grants and research contracts available from various federal departments and agencies and providing the MCSB director with an overview by which he alerts administrators, faculty and staff concerning specific opportunities.

Additionally, she makes personal contacts regularly on a day-to-day and weekly basis with federal agency personnel; she sets up appointments with them for faculty and staff members concerned with proposals; and gives assistance in obtaining program guidleines to those who request it. Her office keeps and updates reference materials pertaining to authorizing legislation, applications, deadline dates and award listings.

The following departments and agencies are the most fruitful sources of federal funds for college and university related programs:

The Department of Agriculture
The Department of Defense
The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
The Departmen of Housing and Urban Development
The Department of Justice
The Department of Labor
The Department of State
The Atomic Energy Commission
The National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities
The National Institutes of Health
The National Science Foundation
The Office of Economic Opportunity
The Environmental Protection Agency

Setting Up a Reference Library. The first order of business for the federal relations officer is to draft a letter which can be sent to all federal agencies, requesting guidelines and other descriptive information pieces concerning their programs, and asking that his institution be placed on their mailing list. This material, when assembled, should be filed conveniently according to agencies and made available for general use. A sample letter of request is as follows:

Mr. John Doe, Information Officer
Bureau of Education for the Handicapped
Room 2100
U.S. Office of Education
7th & D Streets, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20201

Dear Mr. Doe:

This office would be very grateful to receive from you at least (4) copies of all materials pertinent to involvement by institutions of higher education in the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped. We are referring to legislation, materials explaining the program, applications and guidelines for applications, and the names of individuals to call for further information.

If you maintain a mailing list for updating materials or for sending out newsletters or releases, our institution would like to be included on it.

Any assistance you may be able to give us in becoming informed about your programs will be greatly appreciated. If you have any questions, please call me at (Telephone Number).

Sincerely,

Federal Relations Officer

Storing and Filing. A convenient method of storing materials is the verticle file box system. It is flexible and provides accommodation for a great deal of data. Once the appropriate filing system has been adopted, the next problem is to determine the items to be added on a regular basis. Each program box should consist of the following information:

1. Program applications and guidelines. Keep at least three copies available at all times.
2. Program literature. This information is extremely beneficial in identifying patterns of support and priority areas.

The following key information should be included in each agency file:

1. Organization chart. A valuable reference in identifying individuals at each agency.
2. Telephone directories. Copies can be secured from Government Printing Office.
3. News releases and special reports and bulletins issued by each agency. These can be obtained by contacting the Office of Public Information at the various agencies and having your name placed on the appropriate mailing list.

A third useful procedure is to maintain a card index file system that provides information on monthly program deadlines. Deadline information is important. Many funding opportunities are lost when there is not sufficient time for preparing a proposal. On the other hand, when proposal deadlines are maintained in some systematic order the institution has a decided advantage in forecasting projects and allowing for adequate lead time in writing and submitting proposals. A sample information card is pictured below:

May 1, 1973 HUD

COLLEGE HOUSING PROGRAM

Mr. Richard Ulf
College Housing Branch
Publicly Financed Housing Administration
Federal Housing Administration
Department of Housing and Urban Development
7th & D Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Telephone: 202/755-5938

A fourth important component of the federal reference library should be a folder of current legislative bills relating to education, kept on hand at all times and made available for general use. This material gives an opportunity for surveying prospective new federal programs, updating legislation for federal grants and contracts, and for getting ready to move at once in submitting a proposal.

Higher Education Legislation. The principal acts, or titles of acts authorizing higher education grants, loans, and contract programs are as follows:

1. Adult Education Act; Public Law 91-230
   - College community service programs
   - Educational radio and television
   - Experimental projects
   - Manpower training
2. Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended; 42 U.S.C. 2051
   Nuclear Science and Technology:
   - Faculty training
   - Graduate fellowships
   - Graduate training
   - Undergraduate training
   - Radiation control training
   - Summer institutes
3. Bilingual Education Act; Public Law 91-230
4. Clean Air Act of 1963; 42 U.S.C. 1857
   Air Pollution Control
   - Fellowships
   - Manpower training grants
   - Research grants
   - Survey and demonstration grants
5. Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1968
   - Narcotics and drug abuse training
6. Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act of 1971; 42 U.S.C. 295
   - Capitation Grants
   - Disadvantaged students recruitment
   - Education facilities construction
   - Education improvement grants

Fellowships
Scholarships
Student loans
Teacher training

7. Cooperative Research Act of 1954; 20 U.S.C. 331
   Research, research training
   Research facilities
8. Education of the Handicapped Act; Public Law 91-230
9. Education Professions Development Act of 1968; 20 U.S.C. 1111-1119
   Higher education personnel development
   Fellowships
   Institutes and short-term training
10. Higher Education Act of 1965; as amended
    Community service and continuing education
    College library programs
    Student aid
    Emergency assistance
    Institutional aid
    Cooperative education
    Education professions development
    Higher education facilities
    Networks for knowledge
    Graduate programs and fellowships
    Law school clinical experience
    Occupational education
    Improvement of postsecondary education
    National institute of education
    Indian education
    Ethnic heritage programs
    Consumers' education
    Vocational education
    Strengthening developing institutions
11. Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, as amended; 20 U.S.C. 701
    Undergraduate facilities grants
    Graduate facilities grants
    Loans and interest subsidies for facilities

12. Manpower Development and Training act of 1962, as amended; 42 U.S.C. 2571 et seq
    - Classroom occupational training
    - Experimental and demonstration projects
    - Doctoral dissertation research
    - Institutional grants
    - Research contracts
13. Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961; 22 U.S.C. 2451

    Fulbright-Hays Program:
    - Educational exchange
    - Faculty research abroad
    - Foreign curriculum consultants
14. National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958; 42 U.S.C. 2473
    - Space science education project
15. National Defense Education Act of 1958; 20 U.S.C. 441
    - Student loans
    - Fellowships
    - Language and area study
16. National Foundation of the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965; 20 U.S.C. 951 et seq
    - Promotion of the arts
    - Promotion of the humanities
17. National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended; 42 U.S.C. 1861-1875
    - Research project support
    - Computer activities in education and research
    - Graduate fellowships
    - Institutional grants for science
18. Nurse Training Act of 1971; Public Law 92-158
    - Nursing capitation grants
19. Public Health Service Act of 1944, as amended; 42 U.S.C. 241, 294

    Biological and Medical Sciences:
    - Institutional science support
    - Laborary animals
    - Food and drug research
    - Minority schools research support
    - Health professions student loans
20. Vocational Education Amendments of 1968; Public Law 90-576

APPENDIX A

Form 01-100

TARGET AREAS FOR FEDERAL FUNDING

Inventory of Programs	1972-1973	1973-1974	1974-1975
1. Undergraduate Students	$_____	$_____	$_____
___ College Work/Study			
___ Cooperative Education			
___ Educational Opportunity Grants			
___ Placement Services			
___ Special Services for Disadvantaged Students			
2. Faculty & Staff Improvement	_____	_____	_____
___ Arts and Humanities Grants			
___ Workshops, Seminars, and Institutes			
___ Visiting Scholars Program			
___ Research & Development Programs			
3. General & Curricular Improvement	_____	_____	_____
___ Allied Health Professions Program			
___ Library Improvement			
___ Science Improvement			
___ Special Studies Programs			
4. Facilities Improvement	_____	_____	_____
5. In-service Professional Improvement	_____	_____	_____
___ Career Opportunities Program			
___ In-Service Training in Language Arts			
___ In-Service Training in Biology			
___ Summer Institutes for Jr. Hi Teachers			
___ TTT Training Program			
6. Basic Research Programs	_____	_____	_____
___ Educational Research			
___ Natural Science Research			
___ Social Science Research			
7. Community-oriented Programs	_____	_____	_____
___ Small Business Development			
___ Urban Thrust Programs			
8. The Pre-college Student	_____	_____	_____
___ Talent Search			
___ Upward Bound			

APPENDIX B

Form 02-100

CHECK LIST FOR PREPARING PROPOSALS

Date _____ Proposal No. _____

1. Project Title _____

2. Submitted by _____
   Name Department

3. Type of Application: Grant _____ Contract _____

   Nature of Proposal: New ____ Renewal ____ Revision ____ Supplement ____

4. Proposal Deadline _____

5. Sponsoring Agency _____

6. Contracting Office _____

7. Person to whom checks should be mailed:
   _____
   Name Title Address

8. Principal Investigator
   Name Position
   or
   Project Director _____
   Name Position

9. Educational Implication of the Project: _____

   Student enrichment _____ Will expand curriculum _____
   Student research experience _____ Will develop staff personnel _____
   Will expand student services _____ Initiates research in new field _____

10. Reports on Project Required: Monthly ____ Quarterly ____ Annual ____ Final _____

    Distributed to _____

11. Will other faculty and staff participate in project? Yes ____ No ____
    If yes, list by name and academic title; indicate percentage of time each will devote to the project:

Name	Title	% of Time

12. Will students participate in project? Yes _____ No _____
If yes, list by name, indicate total number by category:

Name	How Participate
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

Categories: Graduate ___ Senior ___ Junior ___ Sophomore ___ Freshman ___

13. Will other employees of the college such as technicians and secretaries be required to devote time to the project?

Yes _____ No _____

If yes, list by name and title, describe participation and percentage of time:

Name	Title	How Participate	% of Time
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

14. Is space available? Yes _____ No _____

If yes, in what building _____ Room(s) _____

Approved by: Initials _____

Is this space adequate (size, utilities, ventilation, etc.) for the period of project? Yes _____ No _____

For future requirements of the program? Yes _____ No _____

If space is not available, how much new space will be required?

_____ Sq. ft. By: Rental _____ Renovation _____

Your estimate of cost: $ _____

15. Does project require acquisition of equipment? Yes _____ No _____

If yes, are funds included in budget of project? Yes _____ No _____

If not, indicate cost $_____ and source of funds _____

_____ Approved by _____
(Name and Title)

If college source is involved, Account number _____

Itemize (Show estimated cost of each item) _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

16. Will computer service be required? Yes _____ No _____

If yes, is cost included in budget? Yes _____ No _____

If no, explain _____

_____

17. Does the project involve experiment on human subjects? Yes _____ No _____

If yes, how many _____ Approved by _____
(Name and Title)

18. Will project require outside consultants? Yes _____ No _____

If yes, how many _____

Consultants recommended _____

_____

_____

_____

Reasons recommended _____

_____

_____

19. PROPOSED BUDGET:

	SPONSOR	COLLEGE	TOTAL
Professional salaries and wages	$ _____	$ _____	$ _____
Non-technical salaries: Students, secretaries, technicians, shop personnel, etc.	_____	_____	_____
Consultant services: (1) Rate _____ x days _____	_____	_____	_____
(2) Transportation per diem	_____	_____	_____

	SPONSOR	COLLEGE	TOTAL
Subcontracting			
Alteration & renovation			
Rental of space			
Equipment			
Research supplies			
Instructional supplies			
Office supplies			
Travel			
Communications			
Computer service			
Publication			
Employee benefits			
All other expenses (Itemize)			
Total Direct Costs	$	$	$
Indirect costs			
Total Project Costs	$	$	$

20. Approvals prior to receipt by Federal Relations Office:

_____
Department Chairman

_____
Academic Dean

21. Approvals after receipt by Federal Relations Office:

_____
Federal Relations Officer

_____
President

22. Special condition or remarks concerning approval of the proposal:

_____

APPENDIX C

Form 03-100

PROJECT PROPOSAL

(Prepare four copies; submit with draft of proposal)

Date _____ No. _____

Originator _____ Department _____

Project Title _____

_____

Brief Description of Project:

Statement of Purpose
and Need for the Project:

PROPOSAL TIMETABLE: _____ / _____ / _____
Submission of Proposal | Begin Project | Complete Project

ESTIMATE OF COSTS: _____ _____ _____
Original Cost | Annual Operating Cost | Other

Other Significant
Times or Dates _____

SUGGESTED SOURCES OF FUNDS: 1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

_____ / _____ / _____
Recommended by – Dean | Approved by – President | Recorded by – FRO/DO

APPENDIX D

Form 04-100

PROPOSAL REGISTER

(Sample Arrangement: 14-Column Post-binder Loose Leaf Entries)

(1) Date of Entry	(2) Proposal Number	(3) Amount of Funding		(4) Proposal Title	(5) Funding Agency	(6) Agency Officer
		Project Operation	Indirect Cost			

(7) Project Director	(8) Academic Department	(9) Total Staff	(10) Total Clients	(11) Duration of Project	(12) Date of the Final Report	(13) Federal Relations Officer	(14) Remarks

APPENDIX E

Form 05-100

PROPOSAL FILE CARD

Title _____ Date _____
Amount _____ Description _____

Investigator/Originator _____
Approval _____
Recommendation _____

Action _____

Final Disposition _____

PROPOSAL RECORD–FEDERAL RELATIONS

APPENDIX F

Form 06-100

FEDERAL AGENCIES CLEARED FOR CONTACT

(List the potential Agencies to which a particular academic area might submit a proposal)

Subject-Area	Potential Agency	Program	Deadline Date

APPENDIX G

Form 07-100

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE REPORT

Evaluation Summary

For the year ending _____ Total Projects _____ Total Funds: $ _____

PART ONE: Overall Review

1. What facets of college life at this institution are subsidized by Federal grants:

	Yes	No	Amount
a. Undergraduate students?	_____	_____	$ _____
b. Graduate and professional students?	_____	_____	_____
c. Faculty and staff improvement?	_____	_____	_____
d. General program & curriculum improvement?	_____	_____	_____
e. In-service professional improvement?	_____	_____	_____
f. Basic research programs?	_____	_____	_____
g. Community-oriented programs?	_____	_____	_____
h. Pre-college students?	_____	_____	_____

2. How have Federal funds affected this institution as an educational enterprise:

   a. In range of activities?

   b. In important changes?

PART TWO: Summary and Analysis

1. How has the availability of Federal funds affected fiscal operations:

   a. As of June 30, how many special programs and projects have been in operation at this institution for the fiscal year? _____

   b. What total amount of money has been made available? _____

   c. What percentage of the total college budget does that sum represent? _____

2. What has been the impact upon employment at the college:

   a. What total number of persons were carried on the payrolls of special programs as full-time employees? _____

   b. As part-time employees? _____

   c. How many of the institution's employees have been affected directly? _____

   d. How many of the regular faculty and staff received perquisites or increments or pay supplements (within the spirit of the college's policy on additional compensation? _____

3. What has been the impact on curriculum and services:

   a. Has the availability of special funds served to resuscitate any programs or services? Yes _____ No _____

      Specify /_____
      _____
      _____
      _____

   b. How many of these funds have been used as a "seeding" resource? _____

      Specify /_____
      _____
      _____

   c. As indicated by changes in the enrollment trend, how many academic programs can be cited as examples of revitalized interest and growth? _____

      Specify /_____
      _____
      _____

4. What has been the impact on public relations:

   a. By what percent has the institution's overall enrollment been increased this year over the previous year? _____

   b. By what percent increase this year over last has the college had in its fund-raising efforts? _____

   c. Can specific instances of improved public relations be cited? Yes _____ No _____

      Specify /_____
      _____
      _____
      _____
      _____
      _____

5. What has been the impact on institutional goals:

   a. As a result of proposals funded, how many specific institutional goals, i.e., program or personnel objectives, were satisfied this year? _____

      Specify /_____
      _____
      _____
      _____
      _____
      _____

   b. What amount of money was involved in these objectives? _____

   c. How many proposals submitted were unsuccessful? _____

   d. Involving what total amount of money? _____

General Remarks:

_____

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

JOHN F. POTTS, born in Hot Springs, Arkansas, is Director of the Moton College Service Bureau. Founder and the first director of the Triangle Association of Colleges in Columbia, South Carolina, Dr. Potts served as president of Voorhees College, Denmark, South Carolina for sixteen years. He has contributed articles to several educational journals including A Handbook for Administrators. (McGraw Hill, 1970)

L.A. WARNER, born in Charlotte, North Carolina, is a Field Coordinator for the Moton College Service Bureau. He has served as Director of Development at Johnson C. Smith University, Charlotte, North Carolina, and participated in the first Ford Foundation Intern Program in Development at Temple University. Warner presented a paper at a subsequent intern workshop entitled "On the Firing Line for Predominately Black Colleges".

LEONARD E. DAWSON, born in Augusta, Georgia, is Associate Director of Moton College Service Bureau. Prior to joining the staff of MCSB, he was a program specialist for the U.S. Office of Education and served as Dean of Instruction at Paine College, Augusta, Georgia. Dawson has written for several educational journals including the GTEA Herald and Teachers College Record. He edited the MCSB publication "A Report of a Survey of Federal Support for Fifty-Four Black Colleges". (May, 1973)

J. WILEY BROWN, born in Jackson, Mississippi, is a Field Coordinator for the Moton College Service Bureau. Before joining the Bureau, Brown served as Professor of Religion and Philosophy and Director of Development at Houston-Tillotson College, Austin, Texas, and professor of Social Science and Humanities at Jackson State College, Jackson, Mississippi. A recent National Urban League Fellow in the U.S. Department of Labor, he is the author of A Reading Seminar on Great Issues (McCutchan Corp., Berkeley, 1966) and Nature and Meaning: A Handbook in Philosophy, (McCutchan Corp., Berkeley, 1967)

ANTHONY C. CAMPBELL, born in Anderson, South Carolina, is a Field Coordinator for the Moton College Service Bureau. A former Vice President and Dean of Students of Washington Technical Institute, Campbell has served as Vice President and Director of

Innovative Sciences, Inc. of Standford, Connecticut and Manager of Behavioral Systems Project for 3-M Company. He has written extensively and has held lectureships at City University of New York and Institute of African Affairs.

ERNESTINE KNIGHT, born in Birmingham, Alabama, is Administrative Assistant for Research for Moton College Service Bureau. She attended Miles College, in Birmingham and has worked as an administrative assistant/bookkeeper for several social service agencies in the Washington area.